### 1

#### The aff must defend a government policy that recognizes an unconditional workers’ right to strike – hold the line, CX and the absence of a plan prove there’s no I-meet.

#### “Resolved” means to enact a policy by law.

Words and Phrases 64 (Words and Phrases; 1964; Permanent Edition)

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### The agent in the resolution is a government.

#### Debate is a game and we’re all here to win – that means procedural questions like T come first. The only role of the ballot and judge is to vote for whoever does the better debating over the topic question.

#### Vote neg – their interp explodes limits and allows affs to monopolize the moral high ground. The lack of a stable mechanism lets them radically re-contextualize their aff and erase neg ground via perms. Impacts—

#### A] Fairness is good and prior – debate’s a game that requires effective competition and negation, which makes their offense inevitable.

#### B] Cutting negs to every possible aff wrecks small schools, which has a disparate impact on under-resourced and minority debaters.

#### C] Can’t weigh the aff—it’s just as likely that they’re winning it because we weren’t able to effectively prepare to defeat it.

#### D] Inescapable – the AC conforms to every norm of debate – speed, speech times, ballots – proves they value playing the game and isolating T as the one bad rule is arbitrary.

#### E] Probability – ballots can’t shape our subjectivity or create broad political change but can rectify in-round skews.

#### Vote neg – 1AR restarts force late-developing debates that favor the aff since they get a 7-6 time skew and ensure surface-level clash.

#### T isn’t violent – A] I don’t have the power to impose a norm – only to convince you my side is better. T doesn’t ban you from the activity – the whole point is that norms should be contestable – I just say make a better arg next time. B] Exclusion is inevitable – every role of the ballot excludes some arguments and even saying T bad excludes it – that means we should delineate ground along reciprocal lines, not abandon division altogether.

#### No impact turns or RVIs – A] Substance – if T’s bad then we should try debating on substance – impact turns force me to go for T since I need to defend my position. B] Dead end – strategy guides debates so they’ll desire that people read T to beat them on the impact turn – that proves their strategy is reactive and can’t solve since they rely on the structures they critique.

### 2

#### Interpretation: If the someone reads a role of the ballot then they must clarify (1) an explicit mechanism of weighing offense, ex: if the role the ballot is explicitly based on material consequences or principles and reps (2) whether the role the ballot comes before theory.

#### Violation:

#### Standards:

#### 1 – engagement– without offense or theory weighing I don’t know if the args I’m going for are actually relevant or if we’re 2 ships passing in the night – else the 1ar can shift to non-unique 1nc offense o/w: (a) scope – they’ll always shift to the issue they’re ahead on and get extra credence on any role of the ballot clarifications so even if I weigh my offense I’m still behind (b) turns your method – no stasis point limits discussion and just tries to not have any contestation on their offense.

#### 2 – Resolvability – we can’t resolve offense if you don’t say what offense counts. Resolvability is a voting issue.

#### No weighing rotb vs the shell – (a) I don’t indict the rob just how you read it; my model of debate defends your role of the ballot plus specification and (b) it proves the abuse.

#### Vote on fairness – abuse skews your evaluation of substance. Drop the debater – letting the 1AR spec is the abuse. No RVI: (A) I’ll lose to the 2AR collapse every time. (B) Chills legit theory which leads to a race to the bottom—outweighs deterrence since you could just beat a bad theory shell. Use competing interps—reasonability is interventionist.

### Case